

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

Yerington Utility Line Right-of-Way Amendment

Sierra Front Field Office

Carson City

Nevada

89701

775-885-6000

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

Worksheet

U.S. Department of the Interior

Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: Sierra Front Field Office, LLNVC02000

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: NVN 093475

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: *Yerington Utility Line Right-of-Way Amendment*

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lyon County, Nevada

Mount Diablo Meridian, Nevada

T. 13 N., R. 25 E.,

sec. 5, lots 1 thru 3.

APPLICANT: City of Yerington

Description of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

The City of Yerington proposes to amend their right-of-way (ROW) grant, NVN 093475, issued for a water tank, utility lines, and access road within Luzier Lane in Yerington, Nevada. The City of Yerington proposes to install additional buried pipeline along Luzier Lane for the purpose of providing safe drinking water to the Sunset Hills residential community. The additional utility would consist of a 12-inch PVC water pipeline buried approximately four feet below the surface. Installation would begin in the Spring of 2015 and take approximately three months. Installation would involve a four-foot by four-foot trench, sand bedding, pipe, backfill, compaction, and boundary staking. Approximately 10 people and 8 vehicles would be used during installation. The City of Yerington anticipates little or no clearing within the project area, but minor grading may be required to reshape Luzier Lane after installation. The City of Yerington would conduct maintenance when the expected useful life of the pipeline has been exceeded (after approximately 50 years).

This proposal would be a standard Federal Land Management Policy Act (FLPMA) ROW amendment. The amendment would coincide with the existing ROW grant, NVN 093475, and would expire on December 31, 2044. The amendment would be roughly 4,135.04 feet in length and add 3.51 acres to the existing ROW grant. The width of the amendment would vary as described: 40 feet wide for 2,365.35+/- feet, 35 feet wide for 1,048.24+/- feet, and 30 feet wide for 721.45+/- feet.

Land Use Plan Conformance

LUP Name*	Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan	Date Approved:	May 2001
-----------	---	----------------	----------

*List applicable LUPs (for example, resource management plans; activity, project, management, or program plans; or applicable amendments thereto)

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

LND-6: "Exchanges and minor non-Bureau initiated realty proposals will be considered where analysis indicates they are beneficial to the public."

Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Yerington Water Tank, Utility Line, and Road Right-of-Way Project, November 2014 (DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2015-0010-EA). Approved Finding of No Significant Impact and Decision Record, November 25, 2014.

NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

Yes. The Proposed Action, geographic conditions, and resource conditions are essentially similar to those analyzed in the referenced EA. The BLM analyzed alternatives pertaining to the existing right-of-way for a water tank, utility line, and road access (NVN 093475) the referenced EA. The Proposed Action would amend NVN 093475 to include additional utility line for the water tank. Thus, the Proposed Action is essentially similar to the alternatives analyzed in the referenced EA because the amendment is a feature of NVN 093475. The project area is adjacent to the area analyzed in the existing NEPA document; therefore, the project area contains sufficiently similar geographic and resource conditions to those analyzed in the referenced EA.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource value?

Yes. The environmental concerns, interests, and resource values have not changed from the analysis in the EA. The range of alternatives in DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2015-0010-EA remain appropriate for the Proposed Action.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessments, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Yes. The existing analysis in the referenced EA remains valid for the Proposed Action. The project area is not within sage-grouse habitat. There is no new information for the BLM to consider. The anticipated impacts to the resources have not sufficiently changed from the time when the referenced EA was finalized. In accordance with Section 1.A.3 of the 2014 Protocol, this undertaking has no potential to cause effects to historic properties and the BLM has no further obligations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Cultural Resource report on file, see CCDO-CR-15-095.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

Yes. The impacts from the Proposed Action would be similar to the effects analyzed in the referenced EA. The referenced EA described the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to socioeconomic resources and land use authorizations from granting a right-of-way for a water tank, utility line and access road. Similar to the existing right-of-way, the Proposed Action would be located in the same area of existing disturbance (Luzier Lane).

5. Are there public involvement and interagency reviews associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

The BLM conducted a 15-day public review and comment period ending November 24, 2014 for DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2015-0010-EA. Based on public comments; no revisions to the proposed event were to the EA or Proposed Action. On November 25, 2014, the BLM issued the Finding of No Significant Impact and Decision Record for the DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2015-0010-EA. The BLM has determined that no new additional public outreach is necessary for this amendment because DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2015-0010-EA provided adequate internal and external review opportunities.

BLM Staff Consulted

Name	Role	Discipline
Alicia Alfaro	Archeologist	Cultural Resources

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirement of NEPA.


Signature of Project Lead


Shaina Shippen

Signature of NEPA Coordinator


Brian Buttazoni

Signature of the Responsible Official


50 Leon Thomas, Manager,
Sierra Front Field Office

/s/ Victoria Wilkins

Date: 5/19/2015

Note:

The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.